

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

120

**Criminal Misc. No.M-34785 of 2015
Date of decision: October 13, 2015**

Karnail Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 340 read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 for taking action against private respondents No.7 and 8 as they have got order dated 29.09.2015 in Criminal Misc. No.M-33262 of 2015 **Annexure P-6** by concealing certain facts with regard to earlier marriage solemnized with the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it has wrongly been mentioned in the aforesaid petition that it was the first marriage between the parties whereas respondent No.7 is already married with the petitioner in the year 2009 and there is no divorce from him. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner has made representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, Ropar as well as to

SHO, Police Station Nur Pur Bedi, District Ropar which is annexed as Annexure P-7 with the petition but still no action has been taken so far.

In view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation **Annexure P-7** moved by the petitioner and to verify the facts as mentioned in the petition after calling the petitioner as well as private respondents. In case, the factum of earlier marriage is found to be correct, then legal action be taken against them in accordance with law.

However, it is made clear that nothing has been mentioned on the validity of marriage in order dated 29.09.2015 **Annexure P-6** and simply, a direction was issued to consider the representation moved by the petitioners and to take necessary action in accordance with law.

October 13, 2015
sonia g.

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE